

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of May 25, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-7, 15-27, 29-30, 33-34, and 38 have been canceled, claims 8-14, 28, 31, 32, and 39 have been amended, and new claims 40-51 have been added. Claims 8-14, 28, 31-32, 35-37, and 39-51 remain pending and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 8, 32, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as lacking an antecedent basis for “network.” In accordance with the Examiner’s recommendation, the first instance of the phrase “the network” has been changed to “a network” in each of these claims. A similar amendment has been made in claim 31.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-14, 17, 18, 20-22, 25, 26, 28-29, 31, 32, 35, 36, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertrand *et al.* (U.S. patent No. 6,687,252, hereinafter “Bertrand et al.”) in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Publication No. US 2001/0048686 A1) and further in view of Applicant’s alleged admitted prior art (as found in Applicant’s specification).

Claims 7, 19, 27, 30 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertrand et al. in view of Takeda et al. and Applicant’s admitted prior art as applied to claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-26, 28-29, 31-36, and 39 above and further in view of Boudreaux (US Patent No. 6,466,556).

These rejections of the pending claims are respectfully traversed. As recognized in the Office Action, Bertrand et al. does not disclose an Activate PDP Context Request message and a Create PDP Context Request message having an APN field containing information that explicitly indicates requesting one of a private network address and a public network address. As also recognized in the Office Action, Bertrand et al. does not disclose that a public network address or private network address is assigned based on the information contained in an APN field of a Create PDP Context Request message. As recognized in the Office Action, the proposed combination of Bertrand et al. and Takeda et al. does not disclose using destination network

information to assign one of a private network address and a public network address to a mobile station.

In addition, Takeda et al. does not teach features alleged in the Office Action. More specifically, none of the cited passages in Takeda teach that the node identified in the APN (the address thereof) would explicitly (or implicitly) be equivalent to requesting a private or public network address to be assigned to a mobile station. For example, the Office Action cites to paragraphs 26-27 of Takeda et al., however reading onward, paragraphs 28-29 reveal that the process in Takeda returns to the mobile node **the IP address of the gateway node**, and not an address assigned to the mobile station itself (as recited in the present claims). Similarly are cited paragraphs 71-72 of Takeda et al., and further therein in paragraph 74 Takeda et al. teaches that the GGSN sends its own IP address to the mobile station, not an address assigned to the mobile station by which the mobile station could be reached. Similarly paragraphs 89-90 of Takeda et al. fail to teach that an IP address would be assigned to the mobile station, and in particular these paragraphs in Takeda et al. fail to teach that a private or public IP address would be so assigned, depending on the contents of the APN field.

It is respectfully submitted Applicant's specification does not contain any "AAPA" that precludes allowance of the pending claims. The description in the specification on the operation of a NAT, wherein a node having a private address can communicate with nodes outside the private network is different from the Office Action's assertion that a public address would somehow be implicitly requested if a node would be intending to communicate with a node outside the current private network.


The pending independent claims in the application claim an "APN field containing information that explicitly indicates requesting one of a private network address and a public network address to be assigned to [the/a] mobile station." Neither Bertrand et al. or Takeda et al. or alleged AAPA in Applicant's specification, either separately or in combination, teaches or suggests such a feature. Neither Bertrand et al., nor Takeda et al., nor alleged AAPA in Applicant's specification provides any independent motivation or suggestion to combine the use of APNs with the assignment of network addresses in the manner claimed by the Applicant.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (312) 463-5405.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 23, 2007

By: 

Robert H. Resis
Registration No. 32,168
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Direct Dial: 312 -463-5405